

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

BRANDON BRADLEY, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 20-C-82

JOSEPH BEAHM, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO COMPEL

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff's second motion to compel. Plaintiff filed his first motion to compel on June 23, 2020. The court denied the motion because the parties did not meet and confer prior to Plaintiff filing the motion in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37. Plaintiff filed the present motion to compel on July 15, 2020. Plaintiff has again failed to show that he made adequate meet and confer efforts before seeking court intervention. Plaintiff's motion contains no certification that a meet and confer has occurred, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37 ("On notice to other parties and all affected persons, a party may move for an order compelling disclosure or discovery. The motion must include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action."); *see also* Civil L.R. 37 ("All motions to compel disclosure or discovery pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 through 37 must be accompanied by a written certification by the movant that, after the movant in good faith has conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action, the parties are unable to

reach an accord. The statement must recite the date and time of the conference or conferences and the names of all parties participating in the conference or conferences.”). Plaintiff’s pro se status does not exempt him from compliance with the procedural rules. *See Pearle Vision, Inc. v. Romm*, 541 F.3d 751, 758 (7th Cir. 2008) (“[I]t is . . . well established that pro se litigants are not excused from compliance with procedural rules.” (citation omitted)). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s second motion to compel (Dkt. No. 51) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 20th day of July, 2020.

s/ William C. Griesbach

William C. Griesbach
United States District Judge